

THE PARABOLIC MONGE-AMPÈRE EQUATION ON COMPACT ALMOST HERMITIAN MANIFOLDS

JIANCHUN CHU

ABSTRACT. We prove the long time existence and uniqueness of solutions to the parabolic Monge-Ampère equation on compact almost Hermitian manifolds. We also show that the normalization of solution converges to a smooth function in C^∞ topology as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Up to scaling, the limit function is a solution of the Monge-Ampère equation. This gives a parabolic proof of existence of solutions to the Monge-Ampère equation on almost Hermitian manifolds.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let (M, ω, J) be an almost Hermitian manifold of real dimension $2n$. And we use g to denote the corresponding Riemannian metric. For a smooth real-valued function F on M , we consider the Monge-Ampère equation

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} (\omega + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi)^n = e^F \omega^n \\ \tilde{\omega} = \omega + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi > 0 \\ \sup_M \varphi = 0 \end{cases}$$

and the parabolic Monge-Ampère equation

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} = \log \frac{(\omega + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi)^n}{\omega^n} - F \\ \varphi(\cdot, 0) = \varphi_0 \\ \tilde{\omega} = \omega + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi > 0 \end{cases}$$

where $\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi = \frac{1}{2}(dJd\varphi)^{(1,1)}$ and φ_0 is a smooth real-valued function such that $\omega + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi_0 > 0$.

The Monge-Ampère equation (1.1) plays an important role in geometry. When (M, ω, J) is a compact Kähler manifold, Calabi [1] presented his famous conjecture and transformed this problem into (1.1). By using the maximum principle, Calabi [1] proved the uniqueness of solutions to (1.1). In [35], Yau solved Calabi's conjecture by proving existence of solutions to (1.1) when F satisfies $\int_M e^F \omega^n = \int_M \omega^n$.

When (M, ω, J) is a compact Hermitian manifold, (1.1) has been studied under some assumptions on ω (see [4, 9, 12, 27]). For general ω , up to adding a unique constant to F , the existence and uniqueness of solutions were proved by Cherrier [3] for $n = 2$ (and under assumption $d(\omega^{n-1}) = 0$ when $n > 2$) and by Tosatti-Weinkove [28] for any dimensions.

When (M, ω, J) is a compact almost Hermitian manifold, Chu-Tosatti-Weinkove [6] proved the existence and uniqueness of solutions to (1.1), up to adding a unique constant to F .

There are many results of complex Monge-Ampère equation and complex Monge-Ampère type equation, we refer the reader to [5, 7, 10, 11, 14, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36].

For the parabolic Monge-Ampère equation (1.2), when (M, ω, J) is a compact Kähler manifold, Cao [2] proved that there exists a smooth solution for all time (long time existence) and the normalization of this solution converges smoothly to the solution of complex Monge-Ampère equation. When (M, ω, J) is a compact Hermitian manifold, similar results were proved by Gill [8]. And Sun [19] proved the analogous results for the parabolic Monge-Ampère type equation.

As we can see, the results in [2, 8, 19] were proved when the almost complex structure J is integrable. For non-integrable almost complex structure, we prove the following result in this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Let (M, ω, J) be a compact almost Hermitian manifold of real dimension $2n$. For the parabolic Monge-Ampère equation (1.2) on (M, ω, J) , we have*

(1) *There exists a unique smooth solution φ for $t \in [0, \infty)$.*

(2) *Let $\tilde{\varphi}$ be the normalization of φ , i.e.,*

$$\tilde{\varphi} = \varphi - \int_M \varphi \omega^n.$$

Then $\tilde{\varphi}$ converges smoothly to a function $\tilde{\varphi}_\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. And $\tilde{\varphi}_\infty$ is the unique solution of (1.1) on (M, ω, J) , up to adding a unique real constant b to F .

The organization of this paper is as follows: In Section 2, we introduce some notations and basic results which we use in this paper. In Section 3 through 5, we derive some estimates of φ . In Section 6, we use these estimates to prove (1) of Theorem 1.1. In Section 7, we build up the Harnack inequality for positive solutions to the heat type equation on compact almost Hermitian manifold (M, ω, J) , which is the generalized version of Theorem 2.2 in [15]. In Section 8, we apply this Harnack inequality to prove (2) of Theorem 1.1.

Acknowledgments: The author would like to thank his advisor Professor Gang Tian for encouragement and support. The author would also like to thank Professor Valentino Tosatti and Professor Ben Weinkove for suggesting this problem and helpful suggestions. This work was carried out while the author was visiting the Department of Mathematics at Northwestern University, supported by the China Scholarship Council (File No. 201506010010). The author would like to thank the China Scholarship Council for supporting this visiting. The author would also like to thank the

Department of Mathematics at Northwestern University for its hospitality and for providing a good academic environment.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let M be a compact manifold of real dimension $2n$ and J be an almost complex structure on M . Then we have decomposition $T_{\mathbb{C}}M = T_{\mathbb{C}}^{(1,0)}M \oplus T_{\mathbb{C}}^{(0,1)}M$, where $T_{\mathbb{C}}M$ is the complexification of TM , $T_{\mathbb{C}}^{(1,0)}M$ and $T_{\mathbb{C}}^{(0,1)}M$ are the $\pm\sqrt{-1}$ eigenspaces of J . For any 1 form α on M , we define

$$J\alpha(V) = -\alpha(JV)$$

for $V \in TM$. By this definition, the complexified cotangent space $T_{\mathbb{C}}^*M$ has the similar decomposition as $T_{\mathbb{C}}M$. By this decomposition, we introduce the definitions of $(1,0)$ form and $(0,1)$ form. More generally, we can also introduce the definition of (p,q) form. For any (p,q) form β , we define $\partial\beta$ and $\bar{\partial}\beta$ by $\partial\beta = (d\beta)^{(p+1,q)}$ and $\bar{\partial}\beta = (d\beta)^{(p,q+1)}$. It then follows that, for any smooth function f on M , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (dJdf)^{(1,1)} &= (-\sqrt{-1}d\partial f + \sqrt{-1}d\bar{\partial}f)^{(1,1)} \\ &= 2\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}f. \end{aligned}$$

This is the reason why we use $\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi$ to denote $\frac{1}{2}(dJdf)^{(1,1)}$ in Section 1. We also have the following formula (see e.g. [13, (2.5)])

$$(\partial\bar{\partial}f)(V_1, \bar{V}_2) = V_1\bar{V}_2(f) - [V_1, \bar{V}_2]^{(0,1)}(f)$$

for any $V_1, V_2 \in T_{\mathbb{C}}^{(1,0)}M$.

Let g be a Riemannian metric on M . We recall that (M, g, J) is an almost Hermitian manifold if g and J are compatible, i.e.,

$$g(JV_1, JV_2) = g(V_1, V_2)$$

for any $V_1, V_2 \in TM$. We can define the corresponding $(1,1)$ form

$$\omega(V_1, V_2) = g(JV_1, V_2)$$

for any $V_1, V_2 \in TM$. It is clear that

$$g(V_1, V_2) = \omega(V_1, JV_2).$$

And g is called the corresponding Riemannian metric of (M, ω, J) . For convenience, we often use (M, ω, J) to denote (M, g, J) .

For (1.2), we use $\tilde{\omega}$ to denote $\omega + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi$. Here we omit time t when no confusion will arise. Let $\tilde{g}$ be the corresponding Riemannian metric of $(M, \tilde{\omega}, J)$.

We shall use the following notions, for a smooth function f on M and local frame $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ for $T_{\mathbb{C}}^{(1,0)}M$,

$$|\partial f|_g^2 = g^{i\bar{j}}e_i(f)\bar{e}_j(f) \quad \text{and} \quad |\partial f|_{\tilde{g}}^2 = \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}}e_i(f)\bar{e}_j(f).$$

For convenience, we often use f_i and $f_{\bar{i}}$ to denote $e_i(f)$ and $\bar{e}_i(f)$, respectively. As in [6, 18], we define a operator

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} L(f) &= \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} \partial \bar{\partial} f(e_i, \bar{e}_j) \\ &= \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} \left(e_i \bar{e}_j(f) - [e_i, \bar{e}_j]^{(0,1)}(f) \right). \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that L is a second order elliptic operator. Since L is the linearized operator of (1.2), by standard parabolic theory, there exists a smooth solution φ to (1.2) on $[0, T)$, where $[0, T)$ is the maximal time interval and $T \in (0, \infty]$.

In this paper, we say a constant is uniform if it depends only on (M, ω, J) , F and φ_0 . And we often use C to denote a uniform constant, which may differ from line to line. We shall point out that we use Einstein notation convention throughout this paper. Sometimes, we will include the summation for clarity.

3. OSCILLATION ESTIMATE

In this section, we prove the oscillation estimate of solution φ to (1.2). First, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let φ be the solution of (1.2). Then we have*

$$\sup_{M \times [0, T)} \left| \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}(x, t) \right| \leq \left\| \log \frac{(\omega + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \varphi_0)^n}{\omega^n} \right\|_{L^\infty(M)} + \|F\|_{L^\infty(M)},$$

where $[0, T)$ is the maximal time interval of solution φ .

Proof. Differentiating (1.2) with respect to t , we obtain

$$\left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} = 0,$$

where L is defined by (2.1). By the maximum principle, it is clear that

$$(3.1) \quad \sup_{M \times [0, T)} \left| \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}(x, t) \right| \leq \sup_M \left| \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}(x, 0) \right|.$$

By (1.2), we have

$$(3.2) \quad \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}(x, 0) = \log \frac{(\omega + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \varphi_0)^n}{\omega^n} - F(x).$$

Combining (3.1) and (3.2), we get

$$\sup_{M \times [0, T)} \left| \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}(x, t) \right| \leq \left\| \log \frac{(\omega + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \varphi_0)^n}{\omega^n} \right\|_{L^\infty(M)} + \|F\|_{L^\infty(M)}.$$

□

Next, we use Lemma 3.1 to prove the oscillation estimate.

Proposition 3.2. *Let φ be the solution of (1.2). There exists a constant C depending only on (M, ω, J) , F and φ_0 such that*

$$\sup_{M \times [0, T)} |\tilde{\varphi}(x, t)| \leq \sup_{t \in [0, T)} \left(\sup_{x \in M} \varphi(x, t) - \inf_{x \in M} \varphi(x, t) \right) \leq C.$$

where $\tilde{\varphi} = \varphi - \int_M \varphi \omega^n$ and $[0, T)$ is the maximal time interval of solution φ .

Proof. First, (1.2) can be written as

$$(\omega + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \varphi)^n = e^{\tilde{F}} \omega^n,$$

where $\tilde{F} = F + \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}$. By Proposition 3.1 in [6], there exists a constant C depending only on (M, ω, J) and upper bound of $\sup_{M \times [0, T)} |\tilde{F}(x, t)|$ such that, for any $t \in [0, T)$,

$$(3.3) \quad \sup_{x \in M} \varphi(x, t) - \inf_{x \in M} \varphi(x, t) \leq C(M, \omega, J, \sup_{M \times [0, T)} |\tilde{F}(x, t)|).$$

Thus, by Lemma 3.1, we have

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup_{M \times [0, T)} |\tilde{F}(x, t)| &\leq \|F\|_{L^\infty(M)} + \sup_{M \times [0, T)} \left| \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}(x, t) \right| \\ &\leq 2\|F\|_{L^\infty(M)} + \left\| \log \frac{(\omega + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \varphi_0)^n}{\omega^n} \right\|_{L^\infty(M)}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.3) and (3.4), for any $t \in [0, T)$, it is clear that

$$\sup_{x \in M} \varphi(x, t) - \inf_{x \in M} \varphi(x, t) \leq C,$$

for a uniform constant C . Hence, by the definition of $\tilde{\varphi}$, we complete the proof. $\square$

4. FIRST ORDER ESTIMATE

In this section, we prove the first order estimate of solution φ to (1.2).

Proposition 4.1. *Let φ be the solution of (1.2). There exists a constant C depending only on (M, ω, J) , F and φ_0 such that*

$$\sup_{M \times [0, T)} |\partial \varphi|_g^2(x, t) \leq C,$$

where $[0, T)$ is the maximal time interval of solution φ .

Proof. We consider the quantity $Q = e^{f(\tilde{\varphi})} |\partial \varphi|_g^2$, where $\tilde{\varphi} = \varphi - \int_M \varphi \omega^n$ and f is to be determined later. For any $T' \in [0, T)$, we assume

$$\max_{M \times [0, T']} Q(x, t) = Q(x_0, t_0),$$

where $(x_0, t_0) \in M \times [0, T']$. Since g is compatible with J , around x_0 , we can find a local unitary frame $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ (with respect to g) for $T_{\mathbb{C}}^{(1,0)} M$ such that $\tilde{g}_{i\bar{j}}(x_0, t_0)$ is diagonal.

By the maximum principle, at (x_0, t_0) , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.1) \quad 0 &\geq \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) Q \\
 &= \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) (e^f |\partial\varphi|_g^2) \\
 &= e^f \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) |\partial\varphi|_g^2 + 2\operatorname{Re} \left(\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} e_i (|\partial\varphi|_g^2) \bar{e}_i(e^f) \right) + |\partial\varphi|_g^2 \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) e^f.
 \end{aligned}$$

For the first term of (4.1), by direct calculation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.2) \quad \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) |\partial\varphi|_g^2 &= \sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (|e_i e_k(\varphi)|^2 + |e_i \bar{e}_k(\varphi)|^2) \\
 &\quad + \sum_k \varphi_k \left(\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} e_i \bar{e}_i \bar{e}_k(\varphi) - \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} [e_i, \bar{e}_i]^{(0,1)} \bar{e}_k(\varphi) - \left(\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}\right)_{\bar{k}} \right) \\
 &\quad + \sum_k \varphi_{\bar{k}} \left(\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} e_i \bar{e}_i e_k(\varphi) - \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} [e_i, \bar{e}_i]^{(0,1)} e_k(\varphi) - \left(\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}\right)_k \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

In order to deal with the second and third terms of (4.2), we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.3) \quad &\sum_k \varphi_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} \left(e_i \bar{e}_i \bar{e}_k(\varphi) - [e_i, \bar{e}_i]^{(0,1)} \bar{e}_k(\varphi) \right) \\
 &= \sum_k \varphi_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} \left(\bar{e}_k e_i \bar{e}_i(\varphi) - \bar{e}_k [e_i, \bar{e}_i]^{(0,1)}(\varphi) \right) \\
 &\quad + \sum_k \varphi_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} \left(-\bar{e}_i [\bar{e}_k, e_i](\varphi) - e_i [\bar{e}_k, \bar{e}_i](\varphi) + [\bar{e}_i, [\bar{e}_k, e_i]](\varphi) + [\bar{e}_k, [e_i, \bar{e}_i]^{(0,1)}](\varphi) \right) \\
 &\geq \sum_k \varphi_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} \left(\bar{e}_k e_i \bar{e}_i(\varphi) - \bar{e}_k [e_i, \bar{e}_i]^{(0,1)}(\varphi) \right) \\
 &\quad - C |\partial\varphi|_g \sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (|e_i e_k(\varphi)| + |e_i \bar{e}_k(\varphi)|) - C |\partial\varphi|_g^2 \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}},
 \end{aligned}$$

for a uniform constant C . Now, applying $\bar{e}_k$ to (1.2), we get

$$(4.4) \quad \left(\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}\right)_{\bar{k}} = \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} \left(\bar{e}_k e_i \bar{e}_i(\varphi) - \bar{e}_k [e_i, \bar{e}_i]^{(0,1)}(\varphi) \right) - F_{\bar{k}}.$$

Combining (4.3) and (4.4), it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.5) \quad &\sum_k \varphi_k \left(\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} e_i \bar{e}_i \bar{e}_k(\varphi) - \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} [e_i, \bar{e}_i]^{(0,1)} \bar{e}_k(\varphi) - \left(\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}\right)_{\bar{k}} \right) \\
 &\geq \sum_k \varphi_k F_{\bar{k}} - C |\partial\varphi|_g \sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (|e_i e_k(\varphi)| + |e_i \bar{e}_k(\varphi)|) - C |\partial\varphi|_g^2 \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.6) \quad & \sum_k \varphi_{\bar{k}} \left(\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} e_i \bar{e}_i e_k(\varphi) - \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} [e_i, \bar{e}_i]^{(0,1)} e_k(\varphi) - \left(\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} \right)_k \right) \\
 & \geq \sum_k \varphi_{\bar{k}} F_k - C |\partial \varphi|_g \sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (|e_i e_k(\varphi)| + |e_i \bar{e}_k(\varphi)|) - C |\partial \varphi|_g^2 \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.2), (4.5), (4.6) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, for any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.7) \quad & \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) |\partial \varphi|_g^2 \geq (1 - \epsilon) \sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (|e_i e_k(\varphi)|^2 + |e_i \bar{e}_k(\varphi)|^2) \\
 & - \frac{C}{\epsilon} |\partial \varphi|_g^2 \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} + 2 \operatorname{Re} \left(\sum_k \varphi_{\bar{k}} F_{\bar{k}} \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

For the second term of (4.1), since $\bar{e}_i(\tilde{\varphi}) = \bar{e}_i(\varphi)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.8) \quad & 2 \operatorname{Re} \left(\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} e_i (|\partial \varphi|_g^2) \bar{e}_i(e^f) \right) \\
 & = 2 \operatorname{Re} \left(\sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} e^f f' \varphi_{\bar{i}} \varphi_k e_i \bar{e}_k(\varphi) \right) + 2 \operatorname{Re} \left(\sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} e^f f' \varphi_{\bar{i}} \varphi_{\bar{k}} e_i e_k(\varphi) \right) \\
 & = 2 \operatorname{Re} \left(\sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} e^f f' \varphi_{\bar{i}} \varphi_k \left(\tilde{g}_{i\bar{k}} - g_{i\bar{k}} + [e_i, \bar{e}_k]^{(0,1)}(\varphi) \right) \right) + 2 \operatorname{Re} \left(\sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} e^f f' \varphi_{\bar{i}} \varphi_{\bar{k}} e_i e_k(\varphi) \right) \\
 & \geq 2e^f f' |\partial \varphi|_g^2 - 2e^f f' |\partial \varphi|_g^2 - \epsilon e^f (f')^2 |\partial \varphi|_g^2 |\partial \varphi|_g^2 - \frac{C e^f}{\epsilon} |\partial \varphi|_g^2 \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} \\
 & \quad - (1 + 2\epsilon) e^f (f')^2 |\partial \varphi|_g^2 |\partial \varphi|_g^2 - (1 - \epsilon) e^f \sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i e_k(\varphi)|^2 \\
 & \geq 2e^f f' |\partial \varphi|_g^2 - 2e^f f' |\partial \varphi|_g^2 - (1 + 3\epsilon) e^f (f')^2 |\partial \varphi|_g^2 |\partial \varphi|_g^2 - \frac{C e^f}{\epsilon} |\partial \varphi|_g^2 \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} \\
 & \quad - (1 - \epsilon) e^f \sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i e_k(\varphi)|^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

where we used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for the second-to-last inequality. For the third term of (4.1), it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.9) \quad & \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) e^f = e^f (f'' + (f')^2) |\partial \tilde{\varphi}|_g^2 + n e^f f' - e^f f' \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} - e^f f' \frac{\partial \tilde{\varphi}}{\partial t} \\
 & = e^f (f'' + (f')^2) |\partial \varphi|_g^2 + n e^f f' - e^f f' \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} - e^f f' \left(\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} - \int_M \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} \omega^n \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

where we used $|\partial\tilde{\varphi}|_g^2 = |\partial\varphi|_g^2$. Plugging (4.7), (4.8) and (4.9) into (4.1), at (x_0, t_0) , we get

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) \left(e^f |\partial\varphi|_g^2\right) &\geq e^f (f'' - 3\epsilon(f')^2) |\partial\varphi|_g^2 |\partial\varphi|_g^2 + e^f \left(-f' - \frac{C_1}{\epsilon}\right) |\partial\varphi|_g^2 \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} \\ &\quad - e^f f' \left(\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t} - \int_M \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t} \omega^n\right) |\partial\varphi|_g^2 + 2e^f \operatorname{Re} \left(\sum_k \varphi_k F_{\bar{k}}\right) \\ &\quad + (n+2)e^f f' |\partial\varphi|_g^2 - 2e^f f' |\partial\varphi|_g^2, \end{aligned}$$

for a uniform constant C_1 . Now, we define

$$f(\tilde{\varphi}) = \frac{1}{12C_1} e^{-12C_1(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup_{M \times [0,T]} \tilde{\varphi} - 1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon = 2C_1 e^{12C_1(\tilde{\varphi}(x_0, t_0) - \sup_{M \times [0,T]} \tilde{\varphi} - 1)}.$$

By Proposition 3.2, there exists a uniform constant C such that

$$(4.11) \quad f'' - 3\epsilon(f')^2 \geq C^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad -f' - \frac{C_1}{\epsilon} \geq C^{-1}.$$

Combining (4.1), (4.10), (4.11), $f' < 0$ and Lemma 3.1, at (x_0, t_0) , we get

$$(4.12) \quad 0 \geq C^{-1} |\partial\varphi|_g^2 |\partial\varphi|_g^2 + C^{-1} |\partial\varphi|_g^2 \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} - C |\partial\varphi|_g^2 - C.$$

On the other hand, by (1.2) and Lemma 3.1, we have

$$C\omega^n \geq (\omega + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi)^n \geq C^{-1}\omega^n,$$

for a uniform constant C . It then follows that

$$\sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} \geq \left(\frac{\sum_i \tilde{g}_{i\bar{i}}}{\prod_j \tilde{g}_{j\bar{j}}}\right)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \geq C^{-1} \left(\sum_i \tilde{g}_{i\bar{i}}\right)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \geq C^{-1} C(n) \sum_i \tilde{g}_{i\bar{i}}^{\frac{1}{n-1}},$$

where $C(n)$ is a constant depending only on n . It then follows that

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} |\partial\varphi|_g^2 + \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} &\geq C^{-1} \sum_i \left(\frac{|\varphi_i|^2}{\tilde{g}_{i\bar{i}}} + \tilde{g}_{i\bar{i}}^{\frac{1}{n-1}}\right) \\ &\geq C^{-1} \sum_i |\varphi_i|^{\frac{2}{n}} \\ &\geq C^{-1} |\partial\varphi|_g^{\frac{2}{n}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Young's inequality in the second line. Combining (4.12) and (4.13), we get

$$0 \geq C^{-1} |\partial\varphi|_g^{2+\frac{2}{n}}(x_0, t_0) - C |\partial\varphi|_g^2(x_0, t_0) - C.$$

It then follows that

$$|\partial\varphi|_g^2(x_0, t_0) \leq C.$$

Therefore, by the definition of (x_0, t_0) and Proposition 3.2, we have

$$\max_{M \times [0, T']} Q(x, t) = Q(x_0, t_0) \leq C,$$

which implies

$$\max_{M \times [0, T']} |\partial \varphi|_g^2(x, t) \leq C,$$

for a uniform constant C . Since $T' \in [0, T)$ is arbitrary, we complete the proof. $\square$

5. SECOND ORDER ESTIMATE

In this section, we use techniques developed in [6, Section 5] to prove the second order estimate of solution φ to (1.2).

Proposition 5.1. *Let φ be the solution of (1.2). There exists a constant C depending only on (M, ω, J) , F and φ_0 such that*

$$\sup_{M \times [0, T]} |\nabla^2 \varphi|_g \leq C,$$

where ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection with respect to g and $[0, T)$ is the maximal time interval of solution φ .

Proof. Let $\lambda_1(\nabla^2 \varphi) \geq \lambda_2(\nabla^2 \varphi) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{2n}(\nabla^2 \varphi)$ be the eigenvalues of $\nabla^2 \varphi$. It then follows that $\Delta \varphi = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2n} \lambda_\alpha(\nabla^2 \varphi)$, where Δ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator of (M, g) . By $\omega + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \varphi > 0$, it is clear that

$$\Delta^{\mathbb{C}} \varphi = \frac{n \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \varphi \wedge \omega^{n-1}}{\omega^n} > -n,$$

where $\Delta^{\mathbb{C}}$ is the canonical Laplacian of (M, ω, J) . Since the difference between $\Delta \varphi$ and $2\Delta^{\mathbb{C}} \varphi$ just contains first order terms of φ (see e.g. [25, Lemma 3.2]). By Proposition 4.1, we obtain the lower bound of $\Delta \varphi$, i.e.,

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2n} \lambda_\alpha(\nabla^2 \varphi) = \Delta \varphi \geq -C,$$

for a uniform constant C . As a result, we have

$$(5.1) \quad |\nabla^2 \varphi|_g \leq C \max(\lambda_1(\nabla^2 \varphi), 0) + C.$$

Hence, in order to get the upper bound of $|\nabla^2 \varphi|_g$, it suffices to prove $\lambda_1(\nabla^2 \varphi)$ is bounded from above. Now, on the set $\{(x, t) \in M \times [0, T) \mid \lambda_1(\nabla^2 \varphi)(x, t) > 0\}$ (if this set is empty, then we obtain the upper bound of $\lambda_1(\nabla^2 \varphi)$ directly), we consider the following quantity

$$Q = \log \lambda_1(\nabla^2 \varphi) + h(|\partial \varphi|_g^2) + e^{-A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup_{M \times [0, T)} \tilde{\varphi})},$$

where

$$h(s) = -\frac{1}{2} \log \left(\sup_{M \times [0, T)} |\partial \varphi|_g^2 - s + 1 \right), \quad \tilde{\varphi} = \varphi - \int_M \varphi \omega^n$$

and A is a very large uniform constant to be determined later. By direct calculation and Proposition 4.1, it is clear that

$$(5.2) \quad h'' - 2(h')^2 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad C^{-1} \leq h' \leq C,$$

for a uniform constant C . For any $T' \in (0, T)$, we assume that Q achieves its maximum at (x_0, t_0) on $\{(x, t) \in M \times [0, T'] \mid \lambda_1(\nabla^2 \varphi)(x, t) > 0\}$. Now, around $x_0 \in M$, we can find a local unitary frame $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ (with respect to g) for $T_{\mathbb{C}}^{(1,0)}M$ such that, at (x_0, t_0) , $g_{i\bar{j}} = \delta_{ij}$, $\tilde{g}_{i\bar{j}} = \delta_{ij}\tilde{g}_{i\bar{i}}$ and

$$\tilde{g}_{1\bar{1}} \geq \tilde{g}_{2\bar{2}} \geq \cdots \geq \tilde{g}_{n\bar{n}},$$

where $\tilde{g} = \tilde{g}(\cdot, t_0)$. Since g is a Riemannian metric, there exists a normal coordinate system $\{x^\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^{2n}$ centered at x_0 . Note that g and J are compatible, after a linear change of coordinates, at x_0 , we can assume

$$e_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\partial_1 - \sqrt{-1}\partial_2), e_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\partial_3 - \sqrt{-1}\partial_4), \dots, e_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\partial_{2n-1} - \sqrt{-1}\partial_{2n})$$

and

$$(5.3) \quad \frac{\partial g_{\alpha\beta}}{\partial x^\gamma} = \frac{\partial g(\partial_\alpha, \partial_\beta)}{\partial x^\gamma} = 0 \quad \text{for any } \alpha, \beta, \gamma = 1, 2, \dots, 2n.$$

Let V_β be the g -unit eigenvector of $\lambda_\beta(\nabla^2 \varphi)(x_0, t_0)$ for $\beta = 1, 2, \dots, 2n$. Next, we extend the eigenvectors V_β to be vector fields around x_0 as follows. For any point x near x_0 , we define

$$V_\beta(x) = V_\beta^\alpha \partial_\alpha(x) \quad \text{for } \alpha, \beta = 1, 2, \dots, 2n.$$

Now, we want to use the maximum principle to the quantity Q at (x_0, t_0) . However, Q may be not smooth at (x_0, t_0) . In order to deal with this problem, we use a perturbation argument as in [21, 22]. In the coordinate system $\{x^\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^{2n}$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} B &= B_{\alpha\beta} dx^\alpha \otimes dx^\beta \\ &= (\delta_{\alpha\beta} - V_1^\alpha V_1^\beta) dx^\alpha \otimes dx^\beta. \end{aligned}$$

Note that V_1^α and V_1^β are constants. Next, we define

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \Phi &= \Phi_\beta^\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\alpha} \otimes dx^\beta \\ &= (g^{\alpha\gamma} \varphi_{\gamma\beta} - g^{\alpha\gamma} B_{\gamma\beta}) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\alpha} \otimes dx^\beta, \end{aligned}$$

where $\varphi_{\gamma\beta} = \nabla^2 \varphi(\partial_\gamma, \partial_\beta)$. Let $\lambda_1(\nabla^2 \Phi) \geq \lambda_2(\nabla^2 \Phi) \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_{2n}(\nabla^2 \Phi)$ be the eigenvalues of Φ . It then follows that $\lambda_1(\Phi) = \lambda_1(\nabla^2 \varphi)$ at (x_0, t_0) and $\lambda_1(\Phi) \leq \lambda_1(\nabla^2 \varphi)$ near (x_0, t_0) . Most importantly, at (x_0, t_0) , the eigenspace of Φ corresponding to $\lambda_1(\Phi)$ has dimension 1, which implies $\lambda_1(\Phi)$ is smooth near (x_0, t_0) . Hence, we consider the perturbed quantity $\hat{Q}$ defined by

$$\hat{Q} = \log \lambda_1(\Phi) + h(|\partial \varphi|_g^2) + e^{-A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup_{M \times [0, T]} \tilde{\varphi})}.$$

It is clear that (x_0, t_0) is still a local maximum point of $\hat{Q}$. And for $\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, 2n$, V_α are still the eigenvectors of $\lambda_\alpha(\Phi)$ at (x_0, t_0) . By Proposition 3.2 and Proposition 4.1, in order to prove Proposition 5.1, we just need to get the upper bound of λ_1 at (x_0, t_0) . In what follows, we use λ_α to denote $\lambda_\alpha(\Phi)$ for convenience. And we always use C to denote a uniform constant, which may differ from line to line.

Without loss of generality, we assume λ_1 is very large at (x_0, t_0) . Thus, by (5.1), we have

$$(5.5) \quad |\nabla^2 \varphi|_g(x_0, t_0) \leq C\lambda_1(x_0, t_0).$$

First, we have the following lemmas.

Lemma 5.2. *At (x_0, t_0) , we have*

$$(5.6) \quad \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) \lambda_1 \geq 2 \sum_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_\alpha})|^2}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_\alpha} + \tilde{g}^{p\bar{p}} \tilde{g}^{q\bar{q}} |V_1(\tilde{g}_{p\bar{q}})|^2 \\ - 2\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} [V_1, e_i] V_1 \bar{e}_i(\varphi) - 2\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} [V_1, \bar{e}_i] V_1 e_i(\varphi) - C\lambda_1 \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}},$$

where $\varphi_{V_\alpha V_\beta} = \nabla^2 \varphi(V_\alpha, V_\beta)$ for $\alpha, \beta = 1, 2, \dots, 2n$.

Proof. By (5.3), (5.4) and the formula for the derivatives of λ_1 (see e.g. [6, Lemma 5.2]), at (x_0, t_0) , we compute

$$(5.7) \quad \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) \lambda_1 \\ = \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} \sum_{\mu > 1} \frac{V_1^\alpha V_\mu^\beta V_\mu^\gamma V_1^\delta + V_\mu^\alpha V_1^\beta V_1^\gamma V_\mu^\delta}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_\mu} e_i(\Phi_\delta^\gamma) \bar{e}_i(\Phi_\beta^\alpha) + \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} V_1^\alpha V_1^\beta e_i \bar{e}_i(\Phi_\beta^\alpha) \\ - \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} V_1^\alpha V_1^\beta [e_i, \bar{e}_i]^{(0,1)}(\Phi_\beta^\alpha) - V_1^\alpha V_1^\beta \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Phi_\beta^\alpha \\ = 2 \sum_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_\alpha})|^2}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_\alpha} + \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} e_i \bar{e}_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_1}) - \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} [e_i, \bar{e}_i]^{(0,1)}(\varphi_{V_1 V_1}) \\ + \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} V_1^\alpha V_1^\beta \varphi_{\gamma\beta} e_i \bar{e}_i(g^{\alpha\gamma}) - \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} V_1^\alpha V_1^\beta B_{\gamma\beta} e_i \bar{e}_i(g^{\alpha\gamma}) - \nabla^2 \left(\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}\right) (V_1, V_1) \\ \geq 2 \sum_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_\alpha})|^2}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_\alpha} + \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} e_i \bar{e}_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_1}) - \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} [e_i, \bar{e}_i]^{(0,1)}(\varphi_{V_1 V_1}) \\ - C\lambda_1 \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} - \nabla^2 \left(\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}\right) (V_1, V_1),$$

where we used (5.5) and $\lambda_1 \gg 1$ at (x_0, t_0) for the last inequality. By direct calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.8) \quad & \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} e_i \bar{e}_i (\varphi_{V_1 V_1}) - \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} [e_i, \bar{e}_i]^{(0,1)} (\varphi_{V_1 V_1}) \\
&= \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} e_i \bar{e}_i (V_1 V_1 (\varphi) - (\nabla_{V_1} V_1) \varphi) - \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} [e_i, \bar{e}_i]^{(0,1)} (V_1 V_1 (\varphi) - (\nabla_{V_1} V_1) \varphi) \\
&\geq \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} V_1 V_1 (e_i \bar{e}_i (\varphi) - [e_i, \bar{e}_i]^{(0,1)} (\varphi)) - 2\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} [V_1, e_i] V_1 \bar{e}_i (\varphi) \\
&\quad - 2\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} [V_1, \bar{e}_i] V_1 e_i (\varphi) - \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (\nabla_{V_1} V_1) e_i \bar{e}_i (\varphi) + \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (\nabla_{V_1} V_1) [e_i, \bar{e}_i]^{(0,1)} (\varphi) - C\lambda_1 \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} \\
&\geq \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} V_1 V_1 (\tilde{g}_{i\bar{i}}) - 2\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} [V_1, e_i] V_1 \bar{e}_i (\varphi) - 2\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} [V_1, \bar{e}_i] V_1 e_i (\varphi) - \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (\nabla_{V_1} V_1) (\tilde{g}_{i\bar{i}}) - C\lambda_1 \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying $\nabla_{V_1} V_1$ to (1.2), we obtain

$$(5.9) \quad \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (\nabla_{V_1} V_1) (\tilde{g}_{i\bar{i}}) = (\nabla_{V_1} V_1) F + (\nabla_{V_1} V_1) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}.$$

Similarly, applying V_1 to (1.2) twice, we get

$$(5.10) \quad \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} V_1 V_1 (\tilde{g}_{i\bar{i}}) = \tilde{g}^{p\bar{p}} \tilde{g}^{q\bar{q}} |V_1 (\tilde{g}_{p\bar{q}})|^2 + V_1 V_1 (F) + V_1 V_1 \left(\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} \right).$$

By (1.2), Lemma 3.1 and arithmetic-geometry mean inequality, we have $\sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} \geq C^{-1}$ for a uniform constant C . It then follows that $(\nabla_{V_1} V_1) F$ and $V_1 V_1 (F)$ can be bounded by $C\lambda_1 \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}}$. Combining (5.7), (5.8), (5.9) and (5.10), we prove (5.6). $\square$

Lemma 5.3. *At (x_0, t_0) , we have*

$$(5.11) \quad \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) |\partial \varphi|_g^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (|e_i e_k (\varphi)|^2 + |e_i \bar{e}_k (\varphi)|^2) - C \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} - C$$

and

$$(5.12) \quad \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) \tilde{\varphi} = n - \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} - \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} + \int_M \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} \omega^n.$$

Proof. By the same calculation in Section 4 (see (4.7)), for any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) |\partial \varphi|_g^2 &\geq (1 - \epsilon) \sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (|e_i e_k (\varphi)|^2 + |e_i \bar{e}_k (\varphi)|^2) \\
&\quad - \frac{C}{\epsilon} |\partial \varphi|_g^2 \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} + 2\text{Re} \left(\sum_k \varphi_k F_{\bar{k}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By taking $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ and Proposition 4.1, we get (5.11). For (5.12), we compute

$$\left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) \tilde{\varphi} = \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (\tilde{g}_{i\bar{i}} - g_{i\bar{i}}) - \frac{\partial \tilde{\varphi}}{\partial t} = n - \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} - \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} + \int_M \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} \omega^n,$$

as required. $\square$

For convenience, we use $\sup \tilde{\varphi}$ to denote $\sup_{M \times [0, T]} \tilde{\varphi}$ in the following argument.

Lemma 5.4. *At (x_0, t_0) , for any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq & (2 - \epsilon) \sum_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_\alpha})|^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \lambda_\alpha)} + \frac{\tilde{g}^{p\bar{p}} \tilde{g}^{q\bar{q}} |V_1(\tilde{g}_{p\bar{q}})|^2}{\lambda_1} \\ & - (1 + \epsilon) \frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_1})|^2}{\lambda_1^2} + \frac{h'}{2} \sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (|e_i e_k(\varphi)|^2 + |e_i \bar{e}_k(\varphi)|^2) \\ & + h'' \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(|\partial \varphi|_g^2)|^2 + \left(A e^{-A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup \tilde{\varphi})} - \frac{C}{\epsilon} \right) \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} \\ & + A^2 e^{-A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup \tilde{\varphi})} |\partial \varphi|_g^2 - A C e^{-A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup \tilde{\varphi})}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By the definitions of vector fields V_α , the components of V_α are constant. Hence, at (x_0, t_0) , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |[V_1, e_i] V_1 \bar{e}_i(\varphi)| + |[V_1, \bar{e}_i] V_1 e_i(\varphi)| \\ & \leq C \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2n} |V_\alpha V_1 e_i(\varphi)| \\ & = C \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2n} |e_i V_\alpha V_1(\varphi) - V_\alpha [e_i, V_1](\varphi) - [e_i, V_\alpha] V_1(\varphi)| \\ & = C \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2n} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_\alpha}) + e_i(\nabla_{V_\alpha} V_1)(\varphi) - V_\alpha [e_i, V_1](\varphi) - [e_i, V_\alpha] V_1(\varphi)|, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} (5.13) \quad & 2\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} [V_1, e_i] V_1 \bar{e}_i(\varphi) + 2\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} [V_1, \bar{e}_i] V_1 e_i(\varphi) \\ & \leq C \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_1})| + C \sum_{\alpha > 1} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_\alpha})| + C \lambda_1 \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} \\ & \leq \epsilon \frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_1})|^2}{\lambda_1} + \left(\frac{C}{\epsilon} + C \right) \lambda_1 \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} + \epsilon \sum_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_\alpha})|^2}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_\alpha} + \frac{C}{\epsilon} \sum_i \sum_{\alpha > 1} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (\lambda_1 - \lambda_\alpha) \\ & \leq \epsilon \frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_1})|^2}{\lambda_1} + \epsilon \sum_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_\alpha})|^2}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_\alpha} + \frac{C \lambda_1}{\epsilon} \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (5.5) in the last line. Combining the maximum principle, Lemma 5.2, Lemma 5.3, (5.2) and (5.13), at (x_0, t_0) , for any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$, we

obtain

(5.14)

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) \hat{Q} \\
&= \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) \lambda_1 - \frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\lambda_1)|^2}{\lambda_1^2} + h' \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) |\partial\varphi|_g^2 \\
&\quad + h'' \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(|\partial\varphi|_g^2)|^2 - A e^{-A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup \tilde{\varphi})} \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) \tilde{\varphi} + A^2 e^{-A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup \tilde{\varphi})} |\partial\tilde{\varphi}|_{\tilde{g}}^2 \\
&\geq 2 \sum_{\alpha>1} \frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_\alpha})|^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \lambda_\alpha)} + \frac{\tilde{g}^{p\bar{p}} \tilde{g}^{q\bar{q}} |V_1(\tilde{g}_{p\bar{q}})|^2}{\lambda_1} \\
&\quad - \frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_1})|^2}{\lambda_1^2} - \frac{2}{\lambda_1} \left(\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} [V_1, e_i] V_1 \bar{e}_i(\varphi) + \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} [V_1, \bar{e}_i] V_1 e_i(\varphi) \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{h'}{2} \sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (|e_i e_k(\varphi)|^2 + |e_i \bar{e}_k(\varphi)|^2) - C h' \\
&\quad + h'' \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(|\partial\varphi|_g^2)|^2 + \left(A e^{-A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup \tilde{\varphi})} - C - C h' \right) \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} \\
&\quad + A^2 e^{-A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup \tilde{\varphi})} |\partial\varphi|_g^2 - A \left(n - \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t} + \int_M \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t} \omega^n \right) e^{-A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup \tilde{\varphi})},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the first derivative formula of λ_1 (see [6, Lemma 5.2]) and $|\partial\tilde{\varphi}|_{\tilde{g}}^2 = |\partial\varphi|_g^2$ for the last inequality. Therefore, Lemma 5.4 follows from Lemma 3.1, (5.2), (5.13), (5.14) and the fact that $\sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}}$ has a positive uniform lower bound. $\square$

In what follows, for convenience, we use C_A to denote the constant depending only on (M, ω, J) , F , φ_0 and A . In order to prove Proposition 5.1, we split up into different cases.

Case 1. At (x_0, t_0) , we assume that

$$(5.15) \quad \tilde{g}_{1\bar{1}} < A^3 e^{-2A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup \tilde{\varphi})} \tilde{g}_{n\bar{n}}.$$

Since (x_0, t_0) is the local maximum point of $\hat{Q}$, thus we have $e_i(\hat{Q}) = 0$ at (x_0, t_0) , which implies

(5.16)

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_1})|^2}{\lambda_1^2} &= \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |A e^{-A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup \tilde{\varphi})} e_i(\varphi) - h' e_i(|\partial\varphi|_g^2)|^2 \\
&\leq 4 \left(\sup_{M \times [0, T)} |\partial\varphi|_g^2 \right) A^2 e^{-2A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup \tilde{\varphi})} \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} + \frac{4}{3} (h')^2 \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(|\partial\varphi|_g^2)|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining Lemma 5.4 (taking $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$) and (5.16), we obtain

$$(5.17) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 \geq & -6 \left(\sup_{M \times [0, T)} |\partial \varphi|_g^2 \right) A^2 e^{-2A(\bar{\varphi} - \sup \bar{\varphi})} \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} + (h'' - 2(h')^2) \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(|\partial \varphi|_g^2)|^2 \\ & + \frac{h'}{2} \sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (|e_i e_k(\varphi)|^2 + |e_i \bar{e}_k(\varphi)|^2) + (A e^{-A(\bar{\varphi} - \sup \bar{\varphi})} - C) \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} - A C e^{-A(\bar{\varphi} - \sup \bar{\varphi})}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (1.2), (5.15) and Proposition 3.2, at (x_0, t_0) , it is clear that

$$(5.18) \quad C_A \geq \tilde{g}_{1\bar{1}} \geq \tilde{g}_{2\bar{2}} \geq \cdots \geq \tilde{g}_{n\bar{n}} \geq C_A^{-1}.$$

Plugging (5.2) and (5.18) into (5.17), we obtain

$$\sum_{i,k} (|e_i e_k(\varphi)|^2 + |e_i \bar{e}_k(\varphi)|^2) \leq C_A,$$

which implies the upper bound of λ_1 at (x_0, t_0) . This completes Case 1.

Case 2. At (x_0, t_0) , we assume that

$$(5.19) \quad \frac{h'}{4} \sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (|e_i e_k(\varphi)|^2 + |e_i \bar{e}_k(\varphi)|^2) > 6 \left(\sup_{M \times [0, T)} |\partial \varphi|_g^2 \right) A^2 e^{-2A(\bar{\varphi} - \sup \bar{\varphi})} \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}}.$$

By the same argument in Case 1, we still have (5.17). Combining (5.2), (5.17), (5.19) and Proposition 3.2, at (x_0, t_0) , we get

$$0 \geq C_1^{-1} \sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (|e_i e_k(\varphi)|^2 + |e_i \bar{e}_k(\varphi)|^2) + (A - C_1) \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} - C_1 A e^{C_1 A},$$

for a uniform constant C_1 . We can choose A sufficiently large such that $A > C_1 + 1$, then we can get the upper bound of $\sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}}$. Thus, by (1.2), we obtain the positive lower and upper bound of $\tilde{g}_{i\bar{i}}$ for every $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Hence, by the similar argument in Case 1, we get the upper bound of λ_1 at (x_0, t_0) , which completes Case 2.

Case 3. Neither Case 1 nor Case 2 happen.

In this case, we need to deal with the following terms

$$(2 - \epsilon) \sum_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_\alpha})|^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \lambda_\alpha)} + \frac{\tilde{g}^{p\bar{p}} \tilde{g}^{q\bar{q}} |V_1(\tilde{g}_{p\bar{q}})|^2}{\lambda_1} - (1 + \epsilon) \frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_1})|^2}{\lambda_1^2}$$

in Lemma 5.4. In order to do this, we define

$$I = \{i \mid \tilde{g}_{i\bar{i}} \geq A^3 e^{-2A(\bar{\varphi} - \sup \bar{\varphi})} \tilde{g}_{n\bar{n}} \text{ at } (x_0, t_0)\}.$$

Since Case 1 does not happen and $A > 1$, we have $1 \in I$ and $n \notin I$. Without loss of generality, we can assume $I = \{1, 2, \dots, j\}$. By the similar argument of [6, Lemma 5.5], we obtain

Lemma 5.5. *At (x_0, t_0) , for any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$, we have*

$$-(1 + \epsilon) \sum_{i \in I} \frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_1})|^2}{\lambda_1^2} \geq - \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} - 2(h')^2 \sum_{i \in I} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(|\partial\varphi|_g^2)|^2.$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume $\lambda_1 \geq \frac{C_A}{\epsilon^3}$ at (x_0, t_0) (A and ϵ will be chosen uniformly at last). Using the similar arguments of [6, Lemma 5.6, Lemma 5.7, Lemma 5.8], we have the following estimate

Lemma 5.6. *At (x_0, t_0) , for any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{6})$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & (2 - \epsilon) \sum_{\alpha > 1} \frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_\alpha})|^2}{\lambda_1(\lambda_1 - \lambda_\alpha)} + \frac{\tilde{g}^{p\bar{p}} \tilde{g}^{q\bar{q}} |V_1(\tilde{g}_{p\bar{q}})|^2}{\lambda_1} - (1 + \epsilon) \sum_{i \notin I} \frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_1})|^2}{\lambda_1^2} \\ & \geq -3\epsilon \sum_{i \notin I} \frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_1})|^2}{\lambda_1^2} - \frac{C}{\epsilon} \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we prove Proposition 5.1 for Case 3. Combining $\partial\hat{Q} = 0$ at (x_0, t_0) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, for any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{6})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (5.20) \quad & -3\epsilon \sum_{i \notin I} \frac{\tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(\varphi_{V_1 V_1})|^2}{\lambda_1^2} = -3\epsilon \sum_{i \notin I} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |Ae^{-A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup \tilde{\varphi})} e_i(\varphi) - h' e_i(|\partial\varphi|_g^2)|^2 \\ & \geq -6\epsilon A^2 e^{-2A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup \tilde{\varphi})} |\partial\varphi|_g^2 - 6\epsilon (h')^2 \sum_{i \notin I} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(|\partial\varphi|_g^2)|^2 \\ & \geq -6\epsilon A^2 e^{-2A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup \tilde{\varphi})} |\partial\varphi|_g^2 - 2(h')^2 \sum_{i \notin I} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} |e_i(|\partial\varphi|_g^2)|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Combining (5.2), (5.20), Lemma 5.4, Lemma 5.5 and Lemma 5.6, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (5.21) \quad & 0 \geq \left(Ae^{-A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup \tilde{\varphi})} - \frac{C_2}{\epsilon} \right) \sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} + \frac{h'}{2} \sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (|e_i e_k(\varphi)|^2 + |e_i \bar{e}_k(\varphi)|^2) \\ & + \left(A^2 e^{-A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup \tilde{\varphi})} - 6\epsilon A^2 e^{-2A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup \tilde{\varphi})} \right) |\partial\varphi|_g^2 - AC_2 e^{-A(\tilde{\varphi} - \sup \tilde{\varphi})}, \end{aligned}$$

where C_2 is a uniform constant. Now, we choose

$$A = 6C_2 + 1 \text{ and } \epsilon = \frac{1}{6} e^{A(\tilde{\varphi}(x_0, t_0) - \sup \tilde{\varphi})} \in (0, \frac{1}{6}).$$

Thus, at (x_0, t_0) , by Proposition 3.2, (5.2) and (5.21), it is clear that

$$\sum_i \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} + \sum_k \tilde{g}^{i\bar{i}} (|e_i e_k(\varphi)|^2 + |e_i \bar{e}_k(\varphi)|^2) \leq C,$$

for a uniform constant C . By the similar argument in Case 1, we get the upper bound of λ_1 at (x_0, t_0) , which completes Case 3. Hence, we complete the proof of Proposition 5.1. $\square$

6. PROOF OF (1) IN THEOREM 1.1

In this section, we give the proof of (1) in Theorem 1.1. First, we need the following estimate.

Lemma 6.1. *Let φ be the solution of (1.2) and $[0, T)$ be the maximal time interval. For any $\epsilon \in (0, T)$ and positive integer $k \geq 1$, there exists a constant $C(\epsilon, k)$ depending only on (M, ω, J) , F , φ_0 , ϵ and k such that*

$$(6.1) \quad \sup_{M \times [\epsilon, T)} |\nabla^k \varphi(x, t)| \leq C(\epsilon, k).$$

Proof. Combining Proposition 4.1 and Proposition 5.1, it is clear that (1.2) is uniformly parabolic. By the Schauder estimate (see e.g. [16]) and bootstrapping method, in order to prove (6.1), it suffices to prove the Hölder estimate of $\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi$. We split up into different cases.

Case 1. $T < 1$.

In this case, by Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\sup_{M \times [0, T)} |\varphi(x, t)| \leq CT + C \leq C,$$

for a uniform constant C . By Theorem 5.1 in [5], we obtain (6.1).

Case 2. $T \geq 1$.

In this case, for any $b \in (0, T - 1)$, we define

$$\varphi_b(x, t) = \varphi(x, t + b) - \inf_{M \times [b, b+1)} \varphi(x, t)$$

for all $t \in [0, 1)$. Combining Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.2, we have

$$\sup_{M \times [0, 1)} |\varphi_b(x, t)| \leq C(b + 1 - 1) + C \leq C,$$

for a uniform constant C . It is clear that

$$\frac{\partial \varphi_b}{\partial t} = \log \frac{(\omega + \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi_b)^n}{\omega^n} - F$$

for any $(x, t) \in M \times [0, 1)$. By Theorem 5.1 in [5], for any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$[\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi]_{C^\alpha(M \times [b+\epsilon, b+1))} = [\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi_b]_{C^\alpha(M \times [\epsilon, 1))} \leq C(\epsilon, \alpha),$$

where $C(\epsilon, \alpha)$ is a constant depending only on (M, ω, J) , F , φ_0 , ϵ and α . Since $b \in (0, T - 1)$ is arbitrary, it is clear that

$$[\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi]_{C^\alpha(M \times [\epsilon, T))} \leq C(\epsilon, \alpha),$$

as required. $\square$

Now, we are in the position to prove (1) in Theorem 1.1.

Proof of (1) in Theorem 1.1. First, the uniqueness of solution follows from the standard parabolic theory. Next, to prove $T = \infty$, we argue by contradiction. If $T < \infty$, by Lemma 3.1, we have

$$(6.2) \quad \sup_{M \times [0, T)} |\varphi(x, t)| \leq \sup_M |\varphi_0(x)| + T \sup_{M \times [0, T)} \left| \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}(x, t) \right| \leq C(T + 1),$$

for a uniform constant C . Combining (6.2), Lemma 6.1 and short time existence, we can extend the solution φ to $[0, T_0)$ ($T_0 > T$), which is a contradiction. $\square$

7. THE HARNACK INEQUALITY

In this section, we consider the following parabolic equation

$$(7.1) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} u = Lu,$$

where L is defined by (2.1) and φ is the solution of (1.2). Let u be a positive solution of (7.1). We prove the Harnack inequality on almost Hermitian manifold (M, ω, J) (see [33] for the Kähler case and see [8] for the Hermitian case), which is the generalized version of Theorem 2.2 in [15]. Our argument is similar to [15], which is a little different from the arguments given in [33] and [8]. First, we have the following lemmas.

Lemma 7.1. *Let φ be the solution of (1.2). For any positive integer $k \geq 1$, there exists a constant C_k depending only on (M, ω, J) , F , φ_0 and k such that*

$$\sup_{M \times [0, \infty)} |\nabla^k \varphi(x, t)| \leq C_k.$$

Proof. For convenience, we use C_k to denote the constant depending only on (M, ω, J) , F , φ_0 and k . Combining Lemma 6.1 and (1) in Theorem 1.1, we obtain

$$(7.2) \quad \sup_{M \times [1, \infty)} |\nabla^k \varphi(x, t)| \leq C_k.$$

Since φ is uniquely determined by (M, ω, J) , F and φ_0 , we have

$$(7.3) \quad \sup_{M \times [0, 1)} |\nabla^k \varphi(x, t)| \leq C_k.$$

Combining (7.2) and (7.3), we complete the proof. $\square$

Lemma 7.2. *Let u be a positive solution of (7.1). For any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $\alpha > 1$ and $t > 0$, there exists a constant C depending only on (M, ω, J) , F and φ_0 such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) G &\geq \frac{(1 - \epsilon)t}{n} \left(|\partial f|_g^2 - \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \right)^2 - 2 \operatorname{Re} \left(g^{i\bar{j}} e_i(G) \bar{e}_j(f) \right) \\ &\quad - \left(|\partial f|_g^2 - \alpha \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \right) - \frac{C\alpha t}{\epsilon} |\partial f|_g^2 - \frac{C\alpha^2 t}{\epsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

where $G = t(|\partial f|_g^2 - \alpha \frac{\partial f}{\partial t})$, $f = \log u$ and $\tilde{g}$ is the corresponding Riemannian metric of $(M, \tilde{\omega}, J)$.

Proof. Since u is a positive solution of (7.1) and $f = \log u$, by direct calculation, we have

$$(7.4) \quad \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) f = -|\partial f|_{\tilde{g}}^2.$$

Let $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a local frame for $T_{\mathbb{C}}^{(1,0)}M$. First, we compute

$$(7.5) \quad \begin{aligned} L(|\partial f|_{\tilde{g}}^2) &= \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} e_k \bar{e}_l \left(\tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(f) \bar{e}_j(f) \right) - \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} [e_k, \bar{e}_l]^{(0,1)} \left(\tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(f) \bar{e}_j(f) \right) \\ &= \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} e_k \bar{e}_l (\tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(f) \bar{e}_j(f)) + \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_k \bar{e}_l e_i(f) \bar{e}_j(f) \\ &\quad + \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(f) e_k \bar{e}_l \bar{e}_j(f) + 2\operatorname{Re} \left(\tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} e_k (\tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} \bar{e}_l e_i(f) \bar{e}_j(f)) \right) \\ &\quad + 2\operatorname{Re} \left(\tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \bar{e}_l (\tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_k e_i(f) \bar{e}_j(f)) \right) + \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_k e_i(f) \bar{e}_l \bar{e}_j(f) \\ &\quad + \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} \bar{e}_l e_i(f) e_k \bar{e}_j(f) - \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} [e_k, \bar{e}_l]^{(0,1)} (\tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(f) \bar{e}_j(f)) \\ &\quad - \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} [e_k, \bar{e}_l]^{(0,1)} e_i(f) \bar{e}_j(f) - \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(f) [e_k, \bar{e}_l]^{(0,1)} \bar{e}_j(f). \end{aligned}$$

For the first and eighth terms of (7.5), by Lemma 7.1, we have

$$\tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} e_k \bar{e}_l (\tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(f) \bar{e}_j(f)) - \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} [e_k, \bar{e}_l]^{(0,1)} (\tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(f) \bar{e}_j(f)) \geq -C|\partial f|_{\tilde{g}}^2,$$

for a uniform constant C . For the fourth and fifth terms of (7.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &2\operatorname{Re} \left(\tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} e_k (\tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} \bar{e}_l e_i(f) \bar{e}_j(f)) \right) + 2\operatorname{Re} \left(\tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \bar{e}_l (\tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_k e_i(f) \bar{e}_j(f)) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{30} \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} (\bar{e}_l e_i(f) e_k \bar{e}_j(f) + e_k e_i(f) \bar{e}_l \bar{e}_j(f)) + \frac{C}{\epsilon} |\partial f|_{\tilde{g}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

For the second and ninth terms of (7.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_k \bar{e}_l e_i(f) \bar{e}_j(f) - \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} [e_k, \bar{e}_l]^{(0,1)} e_i(f) \bar{e}_j(f) \\ &\geq \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(Lf) \bar{e}_j(f) + E \cdot |\partial f|_{\tilde{g}} - C|\partial f|_{\tilde{g}}^2 \\ &\geq \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(Lf) \bar{e}_j(f) - \frac{\epsilon}{30} \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} (\bar{e}_l e_i(f) e_k \bar{e}_j(f) + e_k e_i(f) \bar{e}_l \bar{e}_j(f)) - \frac{C}{\epsilon} |\partial f|_{\tilde{g}}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second line the term E just contains second derivatives of f .

Similarly, for the third and tenth terms of (7.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(f) e_k \bar{e}_l \bar{e}_j(f) - \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(f) [e_k, \bar{e}_l]^{(0,1)} \bar{e}_j(f) \\ &\geq \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(f) \bar{e}_j(Lf) - \frac{\epsilon}{30} \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} (\bar{e}_l e_i(f) e_k \bar{e}_j(f) + e_k e_i(f) \bar{e}_l \bar{e}_j(f)) - \frac{C}{\epsilon} |\partial f|_{\tilde{g}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging these inequalities into (7.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} L(|\partial f|_{\tilde{g}}^2) &\geq \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{10}\right) \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} (e_k e_i(f) \bar{e}_l \bar{e}_j(f) + \bar{e}_l e_i(f) e_k \bar{e}_j(f)) - \frac{C}{\epsilon} |\partial f|_{\tilde{g}}^2 \\ &\quad + \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(Lf) \bar{e}_j(f) + \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(f) \bar{e}_j(Lf), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$(7.6) \quad \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) |\partial f|_g^2 \geq \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{10}\right) \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} (e_k e_i(f) \bar{e}_l \bar{e}_j(f) + \bar{e}_l e_i(f) e_k \bar{e}_j(f)) - \frac{C}{\epsilon} |\partial f|_g^2 \\ - \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(|\partial f|_g^2) \bar{e}_j(f) - \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(f) \bar{e}_j(|\partial f|_g^2),$$

where we used (7.4) and Lemma 7.1 (note that Lemma 7.1 implies $-C\tilde{g}_{i\bar{j}} \leq \frac{\partial \tilde{g}_{i\bar{j}}}{\partial t} \leq C\tilde{g}_{i\bar{j}}$ for a uniform constant C). Next, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$(7.7) \quad \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \\ = \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i \bar{e}_j \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}\right) - \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} [e_i, \bar{e}_j]^{(0,1)} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}\right) - \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial t^2} \\ = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) f - \frac{\partial \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}}}{\partial t} e_i \bar{e}_j(f) + \frac{\partial \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}}}{\partial t} [e_i, \bar{e}_j]^{(0,1)}(f) \\ \leq -\frac{\partial}{\partial t} |\partial f|_g^2 + \frac{\epsilon}{10\alpha} \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} \bar{e}_l e_i(f) e_k \bar{e}_j(f) + C |\partial f|_g^2 + \frac{C\alpha}{\epsilon} \\ \leq -2\text{Re} \left(\tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(f) \bar{e}_j(f)\right) + \frac{\epsilon}{10\alpha} \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} \bar{e}_l e_i(f) e_k \bar{e}_j(f) + C |\partial f|_g^2 + \frac{C\alpha}{\epsilon},$$

where we used (7.4) and the fact that $-C\tilde{g}_{i\bar{j}} \leq \frac{\partial \tilde{g}_{i\bar{j}}}{\partial t} \leq C\tilde{g}_{i\bar{j}}$ for a uniform constant C . By the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$(7.8) \quad \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} \bar{e}_l e_i(f) e_k \bar{e}_j(f) \geq \frac{1}{n} \left(\tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i \bar{e}_j(f)\right)^2 \\ \geq \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{5}\right) \frac{(Lf)^2}{n} - \frac{C}{\epsilon} |\partial f|_g^2.$$

Combining (7.4), (7.6), (7.7) and (7.8), we have

$$\left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) G = t \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) |\partial f|_g^2 - \alpha t \left(L - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right) \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} - \left(|\partial f|_g^2 - \alpha \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}\right) \\ \geq \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{5}\right) t \tilde{g}^{k\bar{l}} \tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} \bar{e}_l e_i(f) e_k \bar{e}_j(f) - 2\text{Re} \left(\tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(G) \bar{e}_j(f)\right) \\ - \left(|\partial f|_g^2 - \alpha \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}\right) - \frac{C\alpha t}{\epsilon} |\partial f|_g^2 - \frac{C\alpha^2 t}{\epsilon} \\ \geq \frac{(1-\epsilon)t}{n} \left(|\partial f|_g^2 - \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}\right)^2 - 2\text{Re} \left(\tilde{g}^{i\bar{j}} e_i(G) \bar{e}_j(f)\right) \\ - \left(|\partial f|_g^2 - \alpha \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}\right) - \frac{C\alpha t}{\epsilon} |\partial f|_g^2 - \frac{C\alpha^2 t}{\epsilon},$$

as required. $\square$

By using Lemma 7.2 and the maximum principle, we have the following estimate.

Lemma 7.3. *Let u be a positive solution of (7.1). For any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $\alpha > 1$ and $t > 0$, there exists a constant C depending only on (M, ω, J) , F and φ_0 such that*

$$|\partial f|_{\bar{g}}^2 - \alpha \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \leq \frac{C\alpha^3}{\epsilon(\alpha-1)} + \frac{n\alpha^2}{(1-\epsilon)t}.$$

Proof. For any $t' > 0$, we assume

$$\max_{M \times [0, t']} G(x, t) = G(x_0, t_0),$$

where $(x_0, t_0) \in M \times [0, t']$. It then follows that $G(x_0, t_0) \geq G(x_0, 0) = 0$. Without loss of generality, we further assume that $t_0 > 0$. Combining the maximum principle and Lemma 7.2, at (x_0, t_0) , we have

$$(7.9) \quad \frac{(1-\epsilon)t_0^2}{n} \left(|\partial f|_{\bar{g}}^2 - \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \right)^2 - G - \frac{C\alpha t_0^2}{\epsilon} |\partial f|_{\bar{g}}^2 - \frac{C\alpha^2 t_0^2}{\epsilon} \leq 0,$$

for a uniform constant C . By direct calculation, at (x_0, t_0) , we obtain

$$(7.10) \quad \begin{aligned} t_0^2 \left(|\partial f|_{\bar{g}}^2 - \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \right)^2 &= \frac{t_0^2}{\alpha^2} \left(|\partial f|_{\bar{g}}^2 - \alpha \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + (\alpha-1) |\partial f|_{\bar{g}}^2 \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{G^2}{\alpha^2} + \left(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \right)^2 t_0^2 |\partial f|_{\bar{g}}^4 + \frac{2(\alpha-1)Gt_0}{\alpha^2} |\partial f|_{\bar{g}}^2 \\ &\geq \frac{G^2}{\alpha^2} + \left(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \right)^2 t_0^2 |\partial f|_{\bar{g}}^4, \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\alpha > 1$ and $G(x_0, t_0) \geq 0$. Next, by using the inequality $ax^2 - bx \geq -\frac{b^2}{4a}$ for any $a > 0$, $b \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, at (x_0, t_0) , we have

$$(7.11) \quad \frac{1-\epsilon}{n} \left(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} \right)^2 |\partial f|_{\bar{g}}^4 - \frac{C\alpha}{\epsilon} |\partial f|_{\bar{g}}^2 \geq -\frac{C\alpha^4}{\epsilon^2(\alpha-1)^2}.$$

Combining (7.9), (7.10) and (7.11), at (x_0, t_0) , it is clear that

$$\frac{1-\epsilon}{n\alpha^2} G^2 - G - \frac{C\alpha^4 t_0^2}{\epsilon^2(\alpha-1)^2} \leq 0,$$

which implies

$$G^2 - \frac{n\alpha^2}{1-\epsilon} G - \frac{Cn\alpha^6 t_0^2}{\epsilon^2(1-\epsilon)(\alpha-1)^2} \leq 0.$$

This is a quadratic inequality of G . It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} G(x_0, t_0) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{n\alpha^2}{1-\epsilon} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{n\alpha^2}{1-\epsilon} \right)^2 + \frac{4Cn\alpha^6 t_0^2}{\epsilon^2(1-\epsilon)(\alpha-1)^2}} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{n\alpha^2}{1-\epsilon} + \frac{C\alpha^3 t_0}{\epsilon(\alpha-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of (x_0, t_0) , for any point $x \in M$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G(x, t') &\leq G(x_0, t_0) \\ &\leq \frac{n\alpha^2}{1-\epsilon} + \frac{C\alpha^3 t_0}{\epsilon(\alpha-1)} \\ &\leq \frac{n\alpha^2}{1-\epsilon} + \frac{C\alpha^3 t'}{\epsilon(\alpha-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $G(x, t')$, we have

$$\left(|\partial f|_g^2 - \alpha \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \right) (x, t') \leq \frac{C\alpha^3}{\epsilon(\alpha-1)} + \frac{n\alpha^2}{(1-\epsilon)t'}.$$

Since (x, t') is arbitrary, we complete the proof. $\square$

By using Lemma 7.1 and Lemma 7.3, we prove the following Harnack inequality.

Proposition 7.4. *Let u be a positive solution of (7.1). For any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $\alpha > 1$ and $t_2 > t_1 > 0$, there exists a constant C depending only on (M, ω, J) , F and φ_0 such that*

$$\sup_{x \in M} u(x, t_1) \leq \inf_{x \in M} u(x, t_2) \left(\frac{t_2}{t_1} \right)^{\frac{n\alpha}{1-\epsilon}} \exp \left(\frac{C\alpha}{t_2 - t_1} + \frac{C(t_2 - t_1)\alpha^2}{\epsilon(\alpha-1)} \right). \quad (7.12)$$

Proof. For any $x, y \in M$, let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ be the minimal geodesic from y to x (with respect to g). By Lemma 7.1 and Lemma 7.3, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} &\log \frac{u(x, t_1)}{u(y, t_2)} \\ &= \int_0^1 \frac{d}{ds} f(\gamma(s), (1-s)t_2 + st_1) ds \\ (7.13) \quad &\leq \int_0^1 \left(C|\partial f|_g - (t_2 - t_1) \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \right) ds \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \left(C|\partial f|_{\tilde{g}} - \frac{t_2 - t_1}{\alpha} |\partial f|_{\tilde{g}}^2 \right) + \frac{t_2 - t_1}{\alpha} \left(\frac{C\alpha^3}{\epsilon(\alpha-1)} + \frac{n\alpha^2}{(1-\epsilon)t} \right) ds \\ &\leq \frac{C\alpha}{t_2 - t_1} + \frac{C(t_2 - t_1)\alpha^2}{\epsilon(\alpha-1)} + \frac{n\alpha}{1-\epsilon} \log \left(\frac{t_2}{t_1} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $t = (1-s)t_2 + st_1$ in the fourth line. By (7.13), we obtain (7.12). $\square$

8. PROOF OF (2) IN MAIN THEOREM

In this section, we give the proof of (2) in Main Theorem.

Proof of (2) in Main Theorem. We define $u = \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t}$. First, we claim that for any $t > 0$, there exist constants C and η depending only on (M, ω, J) , F and φ_0 such that

$$(8.1) \quad \theta(t) \leq Ce^{-\eta t},$$

where $\theta(t) = \sup_{x \in M} u(x, t) - \inf_{x \in M} u(x, t)$. In order to prove (8.1), we define

$$v_m(x, t) = \sup_{y \in M} u(y, m-1) - u(x, m-1+t)$$

and

$$w_m(x, t) = u(x, m-1+t) - \inf_{y \in M} u(y, m-1),$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume $u(x, m-1)$ is not constant. By the maximum principle, we obtain that v_m and w_m two positive solutions of (7.1). By Proposition 7.4 (taking $\epsilon = \frac{1}{3}$, $\alpha = 2$, $t_1 = \frac{1}{2}$ and $t_2 = 1$), it is clear that

(8.2)

$$\sup_{x \in M} u(x, m-1) - \inf_{x \in M} u(x, m - \frac{1}{2}) \leq C \left(\sup_{x \in M} u(x, m-1) - \sup_{x \in M} u(x, m) \right)$$

and

(8.3)

$$\sup_{x \in M} u(x, m - \frac{1}{2}) - \inf_{x \in M} u(x, m-1) \leq C \left(\inf_{x \in M} u(x, m) - \inf_{x \in M} u(x, m-1) \right).$$

Combining (8.2) and (8.3), we obtain

$$\theta(m-1) \leq \theta(m-1) + \theta(m - \frac{1}{2}) \leq C (\theta(m-1) - \theta(m)),$$

which implies

$$\theta(m) \leq \frac{C-1}{C} \theta(m-1).$$

By induction, we complete the proof of (8.1).

Next, by the definition of $\tilde{\varphi}$, we get $\int_M \tilde{\varphi} \omega^n = 0$, which implies $\int_M \frac{\partial \tilde{\varphi}}{\partial t} \omega^n = 0$. Hence, there exists $y \in M$ such that $\frac{\partial \tilde{\varphi}}{\partial t}(y, t) = 0$. For any $x \in M$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial \tilde{\varphi}}{\partial t}(x, t) \right| &= \left| \frac{\partial \tilde{\varphi}}{\partial t}(x, t) - \frac{\partial \tilde{\varphi}}{\partial t}(y, t) \right| \\ (8.4) \quad &= |u(x, t) - u(y, t)| \\ &\leq \theta(t) \\ &\leq C e^{-\eta t}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (8.1) in the last line. By the definition of $\tilde{\varphi}$ and Lemma 7.1, for any positive integer $k \geq 1$, it is clear that

$$(8.5) \quad \sup_{M \times [0, \infty)} |\nabla^k \tilde{\varphi}(x, t)| = \sup_{M \times [0, \infty)} |\nabla^k \varphi(x, t)| \leq C_k,$$

where C_k is the constant depending only on (M, ω, J) , F , φ_0 and k . Combining (8.4), (8.5) and Arzela-Ascoli Theorem, there exists a smooth function $\tilde{\varphi}_\infty$ such that

$$(8.6) \quad \tilde{\varphi} \xrightarrow{C^\infty} \tilde{\varphi}_\infty \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

By the definition of $\tilde{\varphi}$, (1.2) can be written as

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{\varphi}}{\partial t} = \log \frac{(\omega + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \tilde{\varphi})^n}{\omega^n} - F - \int_M \left(\log \frac{(\omega + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \tilde{\varphi})^n}{\omega^n} - F \right) \omega^n.$$

Let $t \rightarrow \infty$, by (8.4) and (8.6), we obtain

$$(\omega + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \tilde{\varphi}_\infty)^n = e^{F+b} \omega^n,$$

where

$$b = \int_M \left(\log \frac{(\omega + \sqrt{-1} \partial \bar{\partial} \tilde{\varphi}_\infty)^n}{\omega^n} - F \right) \omega^n.$$

The uniqueness of $(\tilde{\varphi}_\infty, b)$ follows from the maximum principle (see [6, Section 6]). $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] *E. Calabi*, On Kähler manifolds with vanishing canonical class, Algebraic geometry and topology. A symposium in honor of S. Lefschetz, pp. 78–89. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1957.
- [2] *H.-D. Cao*, Deformation of Kähler metrics to Kähler-Einstein metrics on compact Kähler manifolds, *Invent. Math.* **81** (1985), no. 2, 359–372.
- [3] *P. Cherrier*, Équations de Monge-Ampère sur les variétés Hermitiennes compactes, *Bull. Sc. Math.* **111** (1987), 343–385.
- [4] *J. Chu*, The complex Monge-Ampère equation on some compact Hermitian manifolds, *Pacific J. Math.* **276** (2015), no. 2, 369–386.
- [5] *J. Chu*, $C^{2,\alpha}$ regularities and estimates for nonlinear elliptic and parabolic equations in geometry, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **55** (2016), no. 1, Art. 8, 20 pp.
- [6] *J. Chu, V. Tosatti and B. Weinkove*, The Monge-Ampère equation for non-integrable almost complex structures, preprint, arXiv:1603.00706.
- [7] *S. Dinew, X. Zhang and X. Zhang*, The $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimate of complex Monge-Ampère equation, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **60** (2011), no. 5, 1713–1722.
- [8] *M. Gill*, Convergence of the parabolic complex Monge-Ampère equation on compact Hermitian manifolds, *Comm. Anal. Geom.* **19** (2011), no. 2, 277–303.
- [9] *B. Guan and Q. Li*, Complex Monge-Ampère equations and totally real submanifolds, *Adv. Math.* **225** (2010), no. 3, 1185–1223.
- [10] *B. Guan and Q. Li*, A Monge-Ampère type fully nonlinear equation on Hermitian manifolds, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B* **17** (2012), no. 6, 1991–1999.
- [11] *B. Guan and W. Sun*, On a class of fully nonlinear elliptic equations on Hermitian manifolds, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **54** (2015), no. 1, 901–916.
- [12] *A. Hanani*, Équations du type de Monge-Ampère sur les variétés hermitiennes compactes, *J. Funct. Anal.* **137** (1996), no.1, 49–75.
- [13] *F. R. Harvey and H. B. Lawson*, Potential theory on almost complex manifolds, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **65** (2015), no. 1, 171–210.
- [14] *Y. Li*, A priori estimates for Donaldson’s equation over compact Hermitian manifolds, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **50** (2014), no. 3-4, 867–882.
- [15] *P. Li and S.-T. Yau*, On the parabolic kernel of the Schrödinger operator, *Acta Math.* **156** (1986), no. 3-4, 153–201.
- [16] *G. M. Lieberman*, Second order parabolic differential equations, World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 1996. xii+439 pp. ISBN: 981-02-2883-X.
- [17] *D. H. Phong, J. Song and J. Sturm*, Complex Monge-Ampère equations, *Surveys in differential geometry. Vol. XVII*, 327–410, *Surv. Differ. Geom.*, 17, Int. Press, Boston, MA, 2012.

- [18] *S. Plis*, The Monge-Ampère equation on almost complex manifolds, *Math. Z.* **276** (2014), no. 3-4, 969–983.
- [19] *W. Sun*, Parabolic complex Monge-Ampère type equations on closed Hermitian manifolds, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **54** (2015), no. 4, 3715–3733.
- [20] *W. Sun*, On a Class of Fully Nonlinear Elliptic Equations on Closed Hermitian Manifolds, *J. Geom. Anal.* **26** (2016), no. 3, 2459–2473.
- [21] *G. Székelyhidi*, Fully non-linear elliptic equations on compact Hermitian manifolds, preprint, arXiv:1501.02762.
- [22] *G. Székelyhidi*, *V. Tosatti* and *B. Weinkove*, *Gauduchon metrics with prescribed volume form*, preprint, arXiv:1503.04491.
- [23] *G. Tian*, On the existence of solutions of a class of Monge-Ampère equations, A Chinese summary appears in *Acta Math. Sinica* **32** (1989), no. 4, 576. *Acta Math. Sinica (N.S.)* **4** (1988), no. 3, 250–265.
- [24] *G. Tian*, A third derivative estimate for conic Monge-Ampère equations, preprint.
- [25] *V. Tosatti*, A general Schwarz lemma for almost-Hermitian manifolds, *Comm. Anal. Geom.* **15** (2007), no. 5, 1063–1086.
- [26] *V. Tosatti*, *Y. Wang*, *B. Weinkove* and *X. Yang*, $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimate for nonlinear elliptic equations in complex and almost complex geometry, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **54** (2015), no. 1, 431–453.
- [27] *V. Tosatti* and *B. Weinkove*, Estimates for the complex Monge-Ampère equation on Hermitian and balanced manifolds, *Asian J. Math.* **14** (2010), no. 1, 19–40.
- [28] *V. Tosatti* and *B. Weinkove*, The complex Monge-Ampère equation on compact Hermitian manifolds, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **23** (2010), no. 4, 1187–1195.
- [29] *V. Tosatti* and *B. Weinkove*, The Monge-Ampère equation for $(n-1)$ -plurisubharmonic functions on a compact Kähler manifold, preprint, arXiv:1305.7511.
- [30] *V. Tosatti* and *B. Weinkove*, Hermitian metrics, $(n-1, n-1)$ forms and Monge-Ampère equations, preprint, arXiv:1310.6326.
- [31] *V. Tosatti*, *B. Weinkove* and *S.-T. Yau*, Taming symplectic forms and the Calabi-Yau equation, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* (3) **97** (2008), no. 2, 401–424.
- [32] *Y. Wang*, On the $C^{2,\alpha}$ -regularity of the complex Monge-Ampère equation, *Math. Res. Lett.* **19** (2012), no. 4, 939–946.
- [33] *B. Weinkove*, The J-Flow, the Mabuchi energy, the Yang-Mills flow and Multiplier Ideal Sheaves, PhD thesis, Columbia University, 2004.
- [34] *B. Weinkove*, The Calabi-Yau equation on almost-Kähler four-manifolds, *J. Differential Geom.* **76** (2007), no. 2, 317–349.
- [35] *S.-T. Yau*, On the Ricci curvature of a compact Kähler manifold and the complex Monge-Ampère equation I, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **31** (1978), no. 3, 339–411.
- [36] *X. Zhang*, A priori estimates for complex Monge-Ampère equation on Hermitian manifolds, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 2010, no. 19, 3814–3836.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, PEKING UNIVERSITY, YIHEYUAN ROAD 5, BEIJING, P.R.CHINA, 100871

E-mail address: chujianchun@pku.edu.cn